



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,284	06/27/2001	Kyoung Sub Kim	8733.438.00	1850
30827	7590	06/10/2005	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			WARREN, MATTHEW E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/891,284	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew E. Warren	Art Unit 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on March 30, 2005.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Prior Art Figure 3 (APAF) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 5,637,007).

In re independent claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 the APAF (fig. 3) shows a lamp apparatus for a liquid crystal display comprising a lamp (2) for generating light, a wire (3) for supplying external electric power to the lamp, a soldering (4) for connecting the lamp to the wire, a holder (5) for enclosing the soldering, and a lamp housing (1) for enclosing the holder and the lamp. The APAF shows all of the elements of the claims except the resin in the holder between the soldering and the holder. Suzuki et al. shows (fig. 1) a connector structure in which a housing (2) including wires (3) are connected to a terminal (4) by solder (col. 3, lines 62-67). A resin (10) fills a cavity (5) to provide a seal and fix the wires to their terminals (col. 4, lines 18-28). If the resin of Suzuki et al. is applied to the holder of the APAF, then the solder of the combined invention would inherently resist external forces as the applicant's claimed invention does because the same materials and structure are used. Furthermore, when the resin of Suzuki et al. is

applied to lamp apparatus of the APAF, then the resin will be between both the soldering and the holder and the wire and the holder. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lamp housing of the APAF 3 by inserting resin into the holder portion and enclose the wire at the end of the housing as taught by Suzuki to seal the cavity and fix wires to their terminals.

In re claims 4 and 9, the APAF 1 shows the lamp apparatus is installed at each side of the liquid crystal display case.

In re claims 6, 11, and 12, the APAF 3 shows a soldering (4) electrically connecting the lamp to the wire and a holder (5) passing through the lamp housing to enclose the lamp, wire and the soldering.

Claims 2, 7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art Figure 3 (APAF) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 5,637,007) as applied to claims 1, 5, and 10 above, and further in view of Saito (JP 4-46314).

In re claims, 2, 7, and 13, the APAF in view of Suzuki et al. shows all of the elements of the claims except the specific material of the resin. Saito discloses (abstract and fig. 4) an LCD element having a resin material of epoxy (12) at an end of device to form a reliable seal without bubbles or moisture. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the resin of the APAF and Suzuki by using specific resins such as epoxy at taught by Saito to form a reliable seal.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims 1-13 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant primarily asserts that the combination of the APAF and Suzuki does not show all of the elements of the claims, particularly the amended limitation of the resin in the holder between both the soldering and the holder and wire and the holder. The examiner believes that the combination of the APAF and Suzuki shows all of the elements of the claims, including the added limitations. The APAF 3 shows that there is space between the wires (end portions of 3) and the holder and that there is space between the solder (4) and the holder. Therefore, any material, including resin, introduced into that holder would be between both the soldering and the holder and the wire and the holder. Furthermore, Suzuki shows that the resin (10) within the holder/housing cavity (5) is between both the soldering (not shown) and the holder and the wire (3B) and the holder. Thus, when the resin of Suzuki is combined with the lamp apparatus of the APAF, then the resin in the holder will be between both the soldering and the holder and the wire and the holder, as shown in Suzuki. For these reasons, the examiner believes that the APAF and Suzuki show all of the elements of the claims and that the rejection is still proper. Therefore, this office action is final.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Warren whose telephone number is (571) 272-1737. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and alternating Fri 9:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2815

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MEW

*MEW*

June 8, 2005

*Tom Thomas*

TOM THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER